

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending in this application. The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e); and rejects claim 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2. Support for the amendment to the claim may be found, for example, in the specification at page 18, lines 1-15. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendment and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Badarneh. The Office Action asserts that Badarneh discloses each feature of instant claims 1-9 and 12-17. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Badarneh teaches the operation member drive control means drives the operation member according to an operation pattern that corresponds to the image displayed on the display screen. See Badarneh at Paragraph [0125]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Instant claim 1, as amended, recites "the operation member drive control means drives the operation member according to an operation pattern which corresponds to the image displayed on the display screen." This feature is not disclosed by Badarneh.

In contrast, paragraph [0125] of Badarneh, as cited by the Office Action, merely discloses switches that are exposed to a source of force for force feedback. In Badarneh, movement of the switch by the user is *detected* by elements that send signals to a processor that actuates the switch. Such signals pass from the computer to a screen, which interactively shows *menu alternatives and the like*. Nowhere, however, does Badarneh disclose operation member drive control means driving the operation member according to an operation pattern that corresponds to the image displayed on the display screen.

For at least the foregoing reasons, instant claims 1, 3-9 and 12-17 are not anticipated by Badarneh. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Badarneh in view of Bergman. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is predicated on the notion that Badarneh discloses the features of instant claims 1, 3-9 and 12-17. However, for the reasons stated above, Badarneh fails to disclose such features. Furthermore, nowhere does Badarneh teach or suggest modifying its disclosure to practice the claimed invention. Moreover, Bergman is only cited for disclosing the limitations of instant claims 10 and 11, and nowhere remedies Badarneh's deficiencies with respect to independent claim 1, from which claims 10 and 11 depend.


Thus, Badarneh and Bergman, considered either separately or in combination, fail to disclose, and would not have rendered obvious the features of claims 1 and 3-17. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan C. Cady
Registration No. 56,762

JAO:RCC/amw

Date: October 22, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--